

# ***Planning Commission***

## ***Meeting Minutes***

**January 8, 2015**  
**City Hall, Council Chambers**  
**749 Main Street**  
**6:30 PM**

**Call to Order** – Chairman Pritchard called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M.

**Roll Call** was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present:	Chris Pritchard, Chairman Cary Tengler, Vice Chairman Ann O'Connell, Secretary Steve Brauneis Jeff Moline Tom Rice Scott Russell
Staff Members Present:	Troy Russ, Director of Planning and Building Safety Scott Robinson, Planner II Lauren Trice, Planner I

### **Approval of Agenda –**

Brauneis made motion and O'Connell seconded to approve the agenda. Motion passed by voice vote.

### **Approval of Minutes –**

Brauneis made motion and O'Connell seconded to approve December minutes. Motion passed by voice vote.

**Public Comments:** Items not on the Agenda  
None.

### **Regular Business –**

- **AT&T Antennae – Louisville Recreation Center: Resolution No. 2, Series 2014** - A request for a special review use (SRU) to allow for the placement of 3 sectors of four (4) 8 foot tall rooftop antennas, totaling 12 antennas.
  - Applicant, Owner and Representative: Cliff Spencer
  - Case Manager: Scott Robinson, Planner II

Robinson states that AT&T informs the Planning Commission that they are withdrawing application.

Motion to withdraw the AT&T Antennae, Resolution No. 2, Series 2014 made by Brauneis, seconded by Tengler. Motion passed by voice vote.

## **Regular Business – Public Hearing Items**

- **Moov Fitness Studio: Resolution No. 1, Series 2015** - A request for a Special Review Use (SRU) to allow for the operation of a private fitness studio with retail sales in the Commercial Business (CB) zone district at 1817 Hwy 42.

- Applicant, Owner and Representative: Brandon Terry
- ☐ Case Manager: Lauren Trice, Planner I

### *Public Notice Certification:*

Published in the Boulder Daily Camera on December 21, 2014 and posted in City Hall, Public Library, Recreation Center, Courts, and Police Building and mailed to surrounding property owners and property posted on December 19, 2014.

### *Conflict of Interest and Disclosure:*

None stated.

### *Staff Report of Facts and Issues:*

Trice presented from Power Point.

- Zoned Commercial Business (CB) and application is for a private fitness studio with primarily CrossFit classes and limited retail sales. It will be located in the former Trek building beside the recently approved CorePower Yoga.
- The SRU is required for private studios in the commercial zone business district. This is being presented because of the residential sensitive areas.
- Primary access is from Highway 42 and South Boulder Road.
- Louisville Municipal Code § 17.40.100.A lists five criteria to be considered by the Planning Commission in reviewing a Special Review Use application, which follow. The Planning Commission is authorized to place conditions on their recommendation of approval, if they believe those are necessary to comply with all of the criteria.
- Staff finds that the proposed use is consistent with the criteria for approval of a special review use. The private fitness studio will fill a vacant commercial space, provide a community service to the Louisville citizenry with no foreseeable adverse effects on the surrounding neighborhood.

### *Commission Questions of Staff:*

None.

### *Applicant Presentation:*

Brandon Terry, 2213 Park Lane, Louisville, CO 80027.

Class A finishes to include functional finished gym area, entry used as retail space and check-in area, installation of two treatment rooms for massage and acupuncture with an office, and a small kids play area.

### *Commission Questions of Applicant:*

Pritchard asks about hours of operation.

Terry says hours are listed in packet and vary throughout the day. Open at 5:30 am to 8:30 am, then lunch class, and mostly afternoon operation between 4:00 pm to 8:00 pm.

### *Public Comment:*

None.

### *Summary and request by Staff and Applicant:*

Staff recommends approval.

### *Closed Public Hearing and discussion by Commission:*

Tengler says it seems consistent with Yoga Studio approved last month and is in support.

Brauneis in support.

Moline in support.

O'Connell no comment.

Rice in support.

Russell in support.

Pritchard in support.

Motion by Moline to approve Moov Fitness Studio: Resolution No. 1, Series 2015 - A request for a Special Review Use (SRU) to allow for the operation of a private fitness studio with retail sales in the Commercial Business (CB) zone district at 1817 Hwy 42. Second by Russell. Roll call vote.

Name	Vote
Chris Pritchard	Yes
Cary Tengler	Yes
Steve Brauneis	Yes
Jeff Moline	Yes
Ann O'Connell	Yes
Tom Rice	Yes
Scott Russell	Yes
Motion passed/failed:	Pass

Motion passes 7-0.

- **□Boulder County Housing Authority: Resolution No. 02, Series 2015 - A** request annexation and zoning for the development of affordable senior housing, affordable multi-family housing, art center and artist co-housing.

Case #14-043-AN/ZN

- Applicant, Owner and Representative: Boulder County Housing Authority
- Case Manager: Troy Russ, Director of Planning and Building Safety

*Public Notice Certification:*

Published in the Boulder Daily Camera on December 21, 2014 and posted in City Hall, Public Library, Recreation Center, Courts, and Police Building on Dec 22, 2014. Mailed to surrounding property owners and property posted on December 22, 2014.

*Conflict of Interest and Disclosure:*

Moline states he works for Boulder County in Parks and Open Space Department. He does not think it will cause any reason to unfairly judge the application. Pritchard sees no conflict. The other commissioners agree.

*Staff Report of Facts and Issues:*

Russ presented from Power Point.

- Property is 13.404 acres and a voluntary annexation request by Boulder County Housing Authority (BCHA).
- Locally known as Alconis Property. Applicant is requesting initial zoning of Planned Community Zone District Commercial and Residential (PCZD-C/R).
- Total of 231 dwelling units and 18,000 SF of commercial.
- Requesting compliance/adherence to Title 31, Article 12 of Colorado State Statutes as well as Chapter 16.32 within Louisville Municipal Code.

- The proposed street network matches the Comprehensive Plan, the North Louisville Small Area Plan, and the Hwy 42 Corridor Plan. The proposal continues Hecla Drive from Hwy. 42, near Balfour Senior Living and extends northwest through the proposed annexation to Hecla Drive in Steel Ranch. Also, the proposed GDP provides Kaylix Avenue the opportunity to extend from South Boulder Road to Paschal Avenue in Steel Ranch, creating a parallel roadway to Hwy. 42. This proposed street network divides the proposed annexation into four quadrants, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
- Highway 42 Setbacks: The applicant is requesting a building setback of 40-feet from the existing Hwy. 42 right-of-way (ROW) south of Hecla Drive and 45' north of Hecla Drive. These setbacks are intended to accommodate the future ROW of Hwy. 42 (30-feet needed) and an easement for a piped Goodhue Ditch. The resulting 10' and 15' ditch easements in combination with the Hwy 42 ROW have not been approved by the Goodhue Ditch company. As a result, the applicant added a note to the GDP stating: *"Boulder County Housing Authority shall work with the Goodhue Ditch Company to finalize the necessary easement and setback agreements."*
- Continuance of Parks and Open Space Advisory Board of the Lake to Lake Trail, from Waneka Lake to Marshall Lake, hitting Lake Park as well as Harper Lake and Hecla.
- Currently there is no signal at Hecla but the Plan calls for a signal installation in the future.
- Public Land Dedication: The applicant has provided Public Land Dedication (PLD) calculations based on the requested land uses on the GDP. Staff has reviewed the calculations provided and believes they meet the requirements of Section 16.16.060 in the LMC. Note the PLD is not required until the property is platted within the City of Louisville. Additionally, City Council will determine if the PLD comes in the form of land, or a payment in lieu. The numbers provided on the GDP simply acknowledge the PLD requirement with the annexation and zoning of the property.
- The plan is developed into four quadrants. Planning Area A is 1.88 acres and requests PCZD-C/R. It is located in the Highway 42/South Boulder Road Urban Center. Commercial maximum development allowance is 82,000 SF. They request 18,000 SF of commercial development, 11,000 SF to Art Center not specified. In total, there are 28 units on this site with dwelling density calculation of 15 units per acre.
- Planning Area B is 3.4 acres and requests PCZD-R. It is called urban neighborhood and needs to match adjacent neighbors in character and density. 103 units which calculates to 30 units per acre.
- Planning Area C is 2.77 acres and requests PCZD-R. 69 units which is 25 units per acre.
- Planning Area D is 2.1 acres and requests PCZD-R. 31 units which is 15 units per acre.
- The LMC provides development requirements for City Council annexation considerations. Section 16.32.020 defines the eligibility requirements and 16.32.030 provides the City's development standards. Staff examined the annexation request and has determined the application meets the standards and guidelines for annexation in the LMC. Louisville's Vision Statement and Core Community Values define how the City sees itself and identifies the key characteristics that should be carried into the future. Many of these items described are abstract by design and are difficult to quantify at the zoning level and are more suited for Planned Unit Development, or design level evaluations. The Framework Plan and its supporting principles and policies are more measurable for this analysis. Staff did not find this annexation and zoning application to be working against the Comprehensive Plan's Vision Statement and Core Community Values. Staff also found this annexation and zoning application to be compatible with the Comprehensive Plan's Framework and its supporting principles and policies.
- Building Heights: The applicant is requesting building heights in Planning Areas A and B to be 50-feet in height. The Comprehensive Plan defines building heights as floors of buildings, rather than feet. That was done to provide flexibility in changing building

technologies. Regardless, staff believes the 50-foot building height request warrants an explanation. As a result the applicant added a note to the GDP stating: *"The 50' max building height accommodates two specific instances: a) Planning Area A - a two story commercial building with a steeply pitched 'barn-like' roof form is proposed; and b) Planning Area B - a two-three story residential building with basement level garage parking access is proposed in a location where the height is compatible with building height precedents on the adjacent property."* With the note on the applicant's requested GDP, staff finds the requested building heights consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

- City Zoning: Staff reviewed the annexation and zoning request against the City's existing zoning map and found it compatible. The proposed annexation is surrounded by Steel Ranch (Zoned PCZD – C and R) to the West and north; Balfour Senior Living to the East (Zoned PCZD – C); and Christopher Village and Christopher Plaza (Zoned Commercial Business) to the South. The proposed yard and bulk standards were also found compatible with the surrounding zoning.
- Intergovernmental Agreements: In August of 2012, The City of Louisville and the Louisville Housing Authority entered into an Intergovernmental agreement with Boulder County and the Boulder County Housing Authority concerning affordable housing within the City of Louisville. The City entered into this agreement as the Louisville Housing Authority proposed to transfer its 116 affordable housing units to the Boulder County Housing Authority. In the agreement the City and County agreed that the County would own and manage the City's 116 affordable housing units along with the County's existing 30 units in Louisville. Additionally, the County agreed to build an additional 15 units in Louisville within the next five years.
- The Louisville Fire Department stated they could serve the annexation and reserved specific comments to the property's design following the submittal of a Planned Unit Development (PUD).
- The Boulder Valley School District (BVSD) was a referral for this development. A letter from BVSD dated January 2, 2015 states this development proposes *"a student impact of 20 students on Louisville Elementary, 7 students on Louisville Middle School and 11 students Monarch High School."* Note BVSD anticipated 70 of the proposed Housing authority units to be restricted to seniors and were not used in their student evaluation. The letter goes on to state, *"When considering all other development activity in Louisville (Attachment A), and resident enrollment growth within the attendance areas of Louisville schools, Louisville Middle and Monarch High are able to accommodate projected growth (Chart B). Louisville Elementary, however, will likely exceed its program capacity within 5 years should growth within the existing housing stock of central Louisville continue at its current pace. Elementary capacity in Louisville as a whole, however, is ample to accommodate continued enrollment growth."* Louisville staff underlined the last sentence of the BVSD statement for emphasis. The School Board has agreed to a meeting with City Council at the School District on February 4, 2015 to discuss enrollment solutions.
- Fiscal Impact: The applicant submitted a fiscal impact study completed by Economic and Planning Systems based on the City's current fiscal model. The development program shown in this document (194 units and 18,406 square feet of commercial development) does not match the development program requested on the General Development Plan (231 units and 11,000 sf of commercial development). Staff directed the applicant to update the model. However, the timing of the holiday season and the public hearing schedule, the updated model was not completed in time for the posting of this report; but, the report will be completed prior to the City Council meeting February 17th. Staff is presenting the findings of the initial report for planning commission information. Note these numbers will not reflect the final number for the applicant's requested GDP. Regardless staff anticipates this requested annexation zoning will generate a negative fiscal impact on the City in terms of both annual operating and one time capital. The study makes various assumptions about building unit values, sales per square foot, household income attributable to new residents, the study estimates: *"The*

*BCHA development is estimated to result in approximately \$150,000 in ongoing annual revenue to the City and to generate approximately \$264,000 ongoing annual expenditures. The result is a net fiscal on-going operations balance of negative \$114,000 annually. There is expected to be an annual recurring revenue stream of \$29,000 from sales tax revenue that is dedicated to capital projects, open space, and historic preservation. Therefore, the total net on-going fiscal balance will be negative by \$85,000. The proposed development will have a net negative capital impact based on the model factors. The development will impose \$2,104,000 upon the City in demand for new capital investments. The project is estimated to generate \$1,340,000 in one-time revenue. Thus, the net fiscal balance provides a one-time capital negative impact of \$764,000. Although there is not a large retail component to this project, EPS believes it will have a positive impact on the Christopher Plaza commercial center at the northwest corner of South Boulder Road and Hwy 42."*

*Additional outside communication:*

Email to Planning Department from Alexandra Bradley received on Wednesday, January 7, 2015 regarding BCHA Annexation and Rezoning Application. Motion made by Brauneis to enter email into the record, seconded by Moline. Passed by voice vote.

*Commission Questions of Staff:*

Russell asks about Hecla and whether there is a traffic signal there.

Russ says there is no traffic signal at Hecla at this time. It is a T-intersection.

Tengler asks about Planning Area A being zoning commercial, not commercial/residential. Has this changed.

Russ says in GDP, it should be Commercial/Residential. Last minute fixes to the GDP and the Staff Report may not have reflected it in the graphic referenced.

Tengler asks about fiscal analysis. At what point does Staff think a negative fiscal balance would have impacted the decision for approval.

Russ says it is not sole determinate of any development. This is BCHA coming with a proposal. Staff recognizes the diversity of affordable housing.

Brauneis asks about LES enrollment projection. The 106% projection is concerning but he assumes this is projection unabated. The discussion with City Council and BVSD will hopefully address this projection.

Russ says should the possibility of the projections materialize in the future, BVSD has several actions that they can take to meet it. Old Town Louisville is difficult for BVSD to understand.

Moline asks about public land dedication, is there a park site or trail corridor the Comp Plan identified for this location that the community and staff would want?

Russ says there is the number of plans for the trail corridor (Lake to Lake Trail). Louisville has a partnership with Boulder County Transportation to set aside \$600,000 for an underpass at Highway 42 at the northwest quadrant of this parcel. The Comp Plan does not identify a park location.

Moline says this development has to be amended and added to the Takota GDP. Did the Takota GDP have a limit on number of units?

Russ says it had a maximum. This property is too small to come in as an independent GDP so it needs to be attached. It could have been attached to the Alvenus GDP (Balfour) or Takota or Steel Ranch South. Staff thought the Takota was best.

Moline says although this is added to Takota GDP, does it not need to abide by unit limits?

Russ says it can be viewed as an amendment to that GDP particular to this parcel.

O'Connell asks if any of the adjacent property owners had any objections.

Russ says he has not heard of any objections.

Rice asks about fiscal analysis numbers. Regarding one time capital expenditures, the projection is that it will be \$764,000 in the red. Why is it that much in the red?

Russ says the number of residents coming in will put a demand on capital facilities such as the Rec Center, Police, and roadway network. Based on calculated revenue from one-time investment use tax as well as impact fees, the numbers do not match.

Rice says the goal is to have a net 0 or a positive. Why is it so far from the ideal? This is more than one-third to be in the red.

Russ says it is the type of land use that is proposed as well as the price points of housing units. Fees are based on evaluation and market rates. This is a different price point than the Commission is accustomed to seeing. There is no expectation that a residential development alone necessarily would be positive unless the price points of the homes are high. The Art Underground is currently conceived as 11,000 SF of the commercial development and is a 501(c)(3). There is no revenue from property tax.

Rice asks how this project compares to other residential developments that have been considered in the past.

Russ says that Steel Ranch and North End came in fiscally neutral or slightly positive because they had areas of commercial property; the commercial property at Steel Ranch has not been developed yet. Residential developments generally are negative in fiscal development. From an economic perspective of how much sales it brings in and what residents bring to a city, there are hugely positive economic impacts that are not fiscal.

Rice asks if there are any options to close the gap.

Russ says changing the users in the commercial portion. The infrastructure with Kaylix and Hecla positions the quadrant to perform well economically as well as help Christopher Village.

Rice asks where the funding stream comes from to pay for these impacts, being short \$764,000.

Russ says it comes from annual budgeting. Council looks at annual revenues and budgets.

Rice asks on an ongoing basis, if the model is correct, there will be negative \$85,000/year.

Russ says there are services needed to serve the property and revenue generated from the property in taxes and services may not generate enough revenue to compensate for the expected deficits.

Rice asks about the property just north of this property. Is it annexed into the City? How is it zoned?

Russ says the Davidson Highline subdivision with Divine Canine (doggie daycare) and RV storage at the back. It is zoned Planned Community Commercial.

Rice asks if Kaylix will run through the Davidson Highline subdivision?

Russ says when the Lanterns subdivision dedicated their land, the dotted line shows the Kaylix extension not constructed yet. The City has the right-of-way and funds set aside to construct it through the Lanterns. Staff is in conversation with the Davidson Highline owner since Steel Ranch was approved prior to Lanterns. The City will have to acquire the property.

Russell asks about Planning Area A and D regarding density. He asks if the PC should be considering density in aggregate or by planning area in terms of conformity to Comp Plan?

Russ says by Planning area. Planning Area A is an urban center.

Russell asks about Planning Area A, there is a maximum density up to 30 units/acre, but there will be 15 units. Is there a minimum amount of units?

Russ says it is a fiscal question. In an urban center, it is supposed to be a commercial corridor and not meant to be residential. There will be a mix of units.

Russell says Planning Area B matches 30 units/acres and Planning Area C matches the 25 units/acres. Planning Area D has 15 units/acres. He asks about the maximum allowable building height in this zone district.

Russ says there is no zone district as it is annexed property. 2-3 stories are the guideline. Properties to the west are 50'. Staff measures the elevation of the building, high and low points, and takes the average.

Brauneis asks about traffic concerns. There have been traffic studies looking at Highway 42 and South Boulder Road. Can you share information from them?

Russ says the Highway 42 Plan matched the Comp Plan and densities. The GDP is met by the Highway 42 Plan and the Comp Plan. At PUD, the traffic lanes will be determined. General traffic operation is consistent with the Highway 42 Plan. The most important issue of this portion of Highway 42 is the Kaylix Avenue connection, which will become another north-south road to South Boulder Road and the Christopher Shopping Center.

Russell asks about Parks Department feedback.

Russ says feedback from Parks is that they have no general concerns or comments. They have provided the trail connection.

Pritchard wants clarification. Is it fair to say that the deficit on the fiscal land is basically the cost of fulfilling policies? In regard to transportation, he asks Russ if this will facilitate the need for the traffic signals?

Russ says we anticipate the Pascal signal to be installed in 2015 based on warrants and agreements with CDOT. The Highway 42 Plan with CDOT's endorsement shows signals at Hecla and Pascal. The purpose of the Kaylix extension will be a bigger relief to the residents of Steel Ranch than a signal at Pascal.

*Applicant Presentation:*

Norie Boyd, Boulder County Housing Authority, Planning Division Manager.

Present are Willa Willaford, Housing Division Director; Ian Swallow, Project Manager; Ben Doyle, County Attorney; Nicole Delmage, Barrett Studio Architects.

BCHA is working with Humphries Poli Architects; Milender White Construction; Olson and Associates for civil engineering; and Wenk Associates for landscaping.

- History: In 2012, the BCHA entered into an IGA with Louisville and LHA to transfer LHA 116 affordable housing units over to the Housing Authority. Part of the agreement was that BCHA would invest \$1 million to reposition the properties and renovate them. That investment has already occurred at \$1.3 million. They are also to provide 15 new affordable housing units. This proposal is for slightly more than 15 units, but it is due by 2016 and it is fulfilling that obligation.
- Fiscal impact questions: There are 65 housing vouchers distributed to landlords throughout Louisville which brings \$600,000 to landlords in the City today. We have a Human Services Safety Net program, Housing Stabilization program, and other benefits the County is providing to the City. This plan is consistent with the other community value statements and elements of the Comp Plan to provide much needed affordable housing to serve seniors and families. The plan is strong in addressing affordable housing policy goals which have not had a significant investment over the past 15 years in Louisville. Now is the time to develop affordable housing in the City. Affordable housing will support local businesses especially the Christopher Village to the south.
- The Art Underground will be developed as a partner, a non-profit arts organization to provide dance studios and classes for children. This is an existing local business in downtown Louisville which will expand.
- BCHA thinks this housing development will be a huge benefit for the City although it may not show up "on paper".
- Financing: Low income tax credits as well as State Disaster Relief Funds. Part of BCHA's obligation to these entities is to describe it when presenting to the public. Norie takes a few minutes to fulfill that obligation. The State of Colorado has set aside to support affordable housing especially in disaster communities affected by the September 2013 flood. BCHA will take advantage of a new mechanism of State Low Income Housing Tax Credit which is administered through the Colorado Housing Finance

Authority. It is an investment vehicle that provides private equity into an affordable housing project. Currently, a portion of our project is pursuing a State Low Income Housing Tax Credit for 120 units of affordable housing on this site. The 121 unit project is expected to cost approximately \$36 million, so the project will be requesting approximately \$1.8 million in annual allocation which equals approximately \$10.5 million in total tax credit allocation over the statutory six year period. It is about \$8.8 million in present value. The total cost of the project is about \$36 million; the present value is \$8.8 million. Total annual allocation is \$1,736,000 with an estimated allocation of \$10 million. The Low Income Tax Credit is one mechanism that BCHA use to leverage private equity into the project. We can borrow less, have a lower mortgage, and spend more money on the actual project itself.

- Schedule: BCHA is working aggressively with City Staff because they want to finance this project by applying for low income tax credits as well as State Disaster Relief Funds by February to May 2015. BCHA wants to start infrastructure in summer 2015, and try to begin construction in the third or fourth quarter of 2015.

*Commission Questions of Applicant:*

Moline asks at what point does BCHA make decisions about how many units will be affordable and how many will not be?

Boyd answers the best solution by using Low Income Tax Credits if 100% are affordable homes. The goal to make all of the units affordable to residents earning 60% of the area median income or below. Both senior designated property as well as family (non-senior).

Brauneis asks about Housing Authority ongoing role in the management of the property.

Boyd answers projects are built for the long term view. Properties are not built and then sold.

Boulder County will be invested and sign a 30-40 year lease agreement that restricts the property with funders. There is self-management with case managers who provide resident services. There is facility management as well as wraparound services for clients.

Brauneis asks if there will be managers living on-site?

Boyd says property managers do not live on site but are there during regular business hours.

There is evening financial counseling and some after school programs. There is interaction with different staff and groups whether seniors or families.

Tengler asks about her opinion of the fiscal analysis. Do you agree with those numbers?

Boyd says she does not expect the project to come in positive. The value of providing affordable housing and what can be done for a family is not reflected in the fiscal model. One tool to provide affordable housing with the lowest rent possible but building the highest quality is to request an exception from property tax. The use tax and property tax are not showing up in the model. BCHA does not have to request it, but it helps to keep operating costs low so they can provide service and a well maintained building. The Arts Underground is a 501(c)(3) and is a local business that will be expanding and it is exempt from property tax. BCHA has had two well-attended community meetings where affordable housing is needed for seniors as well as people earning 30% of the area median income which is \$80,000 for a two-person household. BCHA will be borrowing "real" debt at a local bank which generate costs not accounted for in the fiscal model.

Tengler asks about the senior housing and what its characteristics are.

Boyd says senior housing is not skilled nursing. They are independent seniors, typically 55 and older. Some will be two bedroom units with live-in aide.

Tengler asks if there will be concierge service to help with emergencies or rides?

Boyd says she does not know.

Tengler asks what is the anticipated number of senior units and affordable units?

Boyd says all senior housing is affordable housing. The current design has 70 units for seniors with buildings with elevators and accessibility. The project has noncontiguous buildings with seniors distributed throughout the property.

Russell asks about qualifying for affordable housing. Is it different to quality for senior housing? Boyd answers it is the same.

Moline asks how BCHA determined the amount of units.

Nicole Delmage, Barrett Studio Architects, 1944 20<sup>th</sup> Street, Boulder, CO 80302.

In determining the number of units on the site, at some level the site designs itself in terms of the number of units. We try to get the maximum of the number of units for the BCHA program so they get the most affordable housing they can. We also look at logistics of how the site will be drained, satisfy parking, as well as park space and quality space. The Art Underground on the property, we look to incorporate art into the landscape and streetscapes. We look to maximize housing, getting quality of place, and quality of life.

*Public Comment:*

Michael Menaker, 1827 W Choke Cherry Drive, Louisville, CO 80027.

His first comment regards the fiscal model and finds the discussion to be disconcerting. This is the subsidized part of subsidized housing. He is opposed to inclusionary zoning which takes the cost burden of providing low income housing and puts it on people who do not live here yet. He believes strongly that if it is a community value, and it seems to be a community value expressed in every document generated over a decade to provide low income housing, then it is incumbent on us to put our "money where our mouth is". He thinks that cost models are not appropriate to this conversation and should not impact your decision. It is subsidized housing and incumbent on all of us as a community to provide that subsidy. There is a moral obligation here, there is a stated community goal here, and dollars and cents do not enter into it. He is troubled by the proposed balance between family and senior housing. Our needs in Louisville are skewed heavily to seniors and in an appropriate forum, he will discuss that in more detail. He would say to the applicant that you should expect a lot of push back on that mix and lobbying for more senior specific housing which seems to be our particular need. He is troubled by the 28 discussed market rate co-housing artist units. He wants to see that land turned to senior housing as well. He has some concerns about BCHA subsidizing Art Underground as well. He is supportive of this annexation. There is a PUD and final process to hammer out the details of residential types and mixed uses, so there will be plenty of time to talk about it later. He feels strongly that it is incumbent on us as a community to embrace and support affordable housing and for it to be inclusive in our policies, and to make everything done to make this project a success. He urges a positive vote from the PC.

Debby Fahey, 1118 W Enclave Circle, Louisville, CO 80027.

She agrees with everything that Michael Menaker said. It is important to support low income housing and affordable housing, particularly for seniors. She is in favor of more senior housing on this property. She questions the co-housing for the artist community and would rather see that as senior housing. She agrees there will be push back if more senior housing is not provided. With senior housing, there will not be as much of an issue with BVSD because seniors do not generally have children attending elementary school. The plans for the proposed parking show the situation is limited. If there will be limited parking spaces, it could be balanced with making sure it is a very pedestrian and bike friendly community with ways to get in and out safely on foot or on a bike. She is in favor of annexation.

Rob Lathrop, 601 Johnson Street, Louisville, CO 80027

He and his wife own the Davidson Highline subdivision. To address Commissioner O'Connell's question regarding any objections, this is an annexation and GDP. He does not have any

objections at this stage. As the process goes through, he is sure there will be questions and concerns of adjacent property owners and neighbors when they see what the plans really look like. He will address Troy Russ's comment about Kaylix. We have had conversations about Kaylix coming through our property and we do not have an agreement. We have an understanding of what the alignment will be when it is built. Looking at the way the property is laid out, you are severing the property by putting the street through it and it can create problems that have not been addressed yet. He wants to make sure his concerns are part of the record. He has no agreement regarding the street at this time. He is friendly with everyone and willing to talk, but there are issues to be addressed as we go through it. He is generally in support of the annexation. This property obviously needs to be annexed. How much support it gets after we get to see more detail remains to be seen.

*Summary and request by Staff and Applicant:*

Staff recommends Planning Commission approve Resolution No. 2, Series 2015, a resolution recommending approval of an ordinance zoning as Planned Community Zone District - Commercial / Residential (PCZD – C/R) certain property annexed into the City of Louisville and known as the 245 North 96th Street Annexation. Applicant has no further comment.

*Open Public Hearing and discussion by Commission:*

Moline asks if the applicant is interested in commenting on the public comments you just heard regarding co-housing application.

Boyd says BCHA is not subsidizing the artist co-housing. They are partners because it is costly to develop the site. BCHA's goal is affordable housing and make the best use of the public dollars given to invest in the site. We are not subsidizing co-housing or the Art Underground. They are separate saleable parcels that will proportionately carry their share of the cost. We have found that we do need some revenue in order to develop the affordable housing. There is a lot of infrastructure with raw land and two big public streets crossing the site. Water and sewer cost a lot. To keep costs low for our clients, we cannot spend an exorbitant amount. We need partners to get the development done. For the Art Underground, we are not commercial developers and do not know that business. We are relying on them to fulfill that commercial component because it is important to tie Christopher Village commercial component with this site. As to the artist co-housing, we think it is a different product from what we are providing, so we do not partner with someone who is providing market rate rental housing because that undercuts our market and our ability to lease out the land and keep our property occupied. We are looking for a distinctly Louisville partner and it felt like the arts in Louisville are good synergy with the Art Underground. We like the design as a whole and the focus on the arts, and it has given us a lot of creative ideas to influence our design, site planning, and adjacencies. The co-housing could be a really good partner and they are part of Louisville and involved with the community, so she does not think it is a detraction from the affordable housing goals.

*Closed Public Hearing and discussion by Commission:*

Tengler in support of annexation. We can address a lot of issues regarding the specific number of units and parking considerations and road construction when we get into the PUD.

Brauneis is encouraged to hear this discussion. He thinks now is the time for affordable housing for people within Louisville. He thinks balance is important and when we look at the non-economical and non-fiscal benefits of this project, there is a richness to the project that helps balance the numbers in the report.

Moline thanks applicant and staff for working on a project that appears to help accomplish some of the goals in the Comp Plan with regard to urban form and street layout.

O'Connell is in support and recommends approval of the ordinance. It is a good opportunity to speak to some of the visions and values and intent in the Comp Plan. She thinks there will be more concerns for the BVSD, especially Louisville Elementary, and to keep conversations

rolling as we continue with this project. She thinks the benefits far outweigh the fiscal impact and look forward to continuing to hear community input and adjoining neighbor input.

Rice thanks Russ for the written presentation as it contained a lot of information and it was very accessible and easy to understand. He has concerns about the fiscal impact as these are not inconsequential numbers. He is sensitive to the policy considerations that are driven by this kind of project. These are not easy to put specific numbers on as the applicant has given good testimony to as well. It comes down to the question that Commissioner Tengler suggested early on, that it becomes a question of balance and what degree of disparity we have. There comes a point in time when it is so far out of skew that you cannot rationalize it. He appreciates the discussion on fiscal impacts and how it has to be weighed. He supports the project because there are a lot of positives that come out of it.

Russell thanks Norie Boyd and BCHA. He thinks her answer on the fiscal impact questions was probably as good an answer as he has heard anyone give. He thinks our fiscal impact analysis approach is really tricky and not always very helpful because there is no context for it. It does not speak to how we perform financially as a community. The impulse is always to treat it like a financial analysis. We cannot use it that way as there is so much more value to does not get captured. It is a misapplication to think that we can slice this community in every sort of way and every slice is going to look good financially. He is not too concerned about the fiscal analysis. He is impressed with the BVSD response to this query as it is the most substantive information we have received from them. He loves the introduction of the artist co-housing, is a fan of the Art Underground, and thinks their programming is so important to what they are trying to accomplish. He knows there will be pushback. He encourages BCHA to embrace the public input and the dialogue, but remain true to what you are trying to accomplish. He thinks this may be the most important project the PC will do this year as it will have a great impact on our community. He supports annexation.

Pritchard agrees with all comments. He agrees this is important for the community. This is what we have said historically and what we have tried to accomplish.

Motion made by Brauneis to approve Boulder County Housing Authority: Resolution No. 02, Series 2015 - A request annexation and zoning for the development of affordable senior housing, affordable multi-family housing, art center and artist co-housing. Seconded Moline. Roll call vote.

Name	Vote
Chris Pritchard	Yes
Cary Tengler	Yes
Steve Brauneis	Yes
Jeff Moline	Yes
Ann O'Connell	Yes
Tom Rice	Yes
Scott Russell	Yes
Motion passed/failed:	Pass

Motion passes 7-0.

### ➤ **Food Trucks Ordinance – Modification**

#### *Public Notice Certification:*

Posted in City Hall, Public Library, Recreation Center, Courts, and Police Building and City website on December 22, 2014. Since it is a legislative action, Staff did no mailings. The legal posting will occur between first and second reading of City Council.

*Conflict of Interest and Disclosure:*

Pritchard has a disclosure. When the Food Trucks Ordinance was originally submitted involving the Downtown, he recused himself. On the Modification which involves the golf course, he wonders if the PC thinks he should continue to recuse himself. Tengler does not see a conflict given that effectively, the PC is extending the Food Truck Ordinance to the golf course.

*Staff Report of Facts and Issues:*

Russ presented.

Staff is proposing amending Section 17.16.180.A.7.a in the LMC to read as follows (words added are underlined):

- *Districts permitted:* Only public rights-of-way and public parks within non-residential zone districts by temporary use permit, except that ice cream vendors, food trucks contracted for private catered events, **and** food trucks associated with events reserved inside the Louisville Art Center in Memory Square Park, and food trucks associated with the daily operations of the Coal Creek Golf Course and permitted special events at the Golf Course are allowed to operate on public rights-of-way and public parks in residential districts.

The specific request is to allow the concessionaire to operate courtesy carts or food carts on the golf course. This was not included in the original food truck allocation because Staff did not think of this as the same correlated issue. We gave an exemption to Memory Square Park because it is a park tied to the Louisville Art Center in a residential zone district, so we specifically allow it to occur in the previous ordinance. We neglected to accommodate the golf course since it was closed due to the flood. The golf course will be reopening in Spring/Summer 2015 and want to operate the golf course to its full occupation. The specific amendment to Section 17.16.180.A.7.a adds food trucks associated with the daily operation of Coal Creek Golf Course and permitted special events at the golf course so they are allowed in a residential zone district within public owned parks or right-of-way. This would not allow food trucks to operate in the parking lot. This would allow food trucks to operate in the parking lot when it is tied to a special event. They would have to get a Special Event Permit. The intent is to accommodate the Fourth of July celebration or other large City-sponsored events, not to compete with the golf course vendor or others. The day to day operations would be specifically tied to the golf course and the courtesy cart that operates within the course.

*Commission Questions of Staff:*

Tengler asks if there are any other spaces in Louisville that this might be appropriate to extend this ordinance.

Russ answers Staff was approached by some homeowner associations to allow commercial operation of food trucks associated with homeowner association parties. If it is a catered event, it is allowed; however, if they wish to operate as a commercial vendor, it is not allowed. Staff is suggesting to not address that particular concern.

Tengler asks about the golf course occasionally is rented out by various corporate groups for outings. Does this enable them to bring a food truck into the parking lot during one of the sponsored outings? It does not need to be a City sponsored event but a special event.

Russ says if it is a designated special event request with the City Manager's office, then yes.

Moline asks about food trucks associated with the daily operations of the golf course. What is an example?

Russ says the courtesy cart that goes on the course with hot dogs, candy bars, and beer.

Russell discusses an event held at the high school on school property with food trucks. Is this a violation of policy or is it allowed.

Russ says that it was held on BVSD property in the parking lot.

*Public Comment:*

None.

*Summary and request by Staff and Applicant:*

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve.

*Closed Public Hearing and discussion by Commission:*

Russell, Rice, O'Connell, Moline, Brauneis, Tengler, and Pritchard have no comment.

Motion made by Tengler to approve Resolution No. 03, Series 2015 recommending to City Council approval of the Draft Ordinance, amending Title 17 of the Louisville Municipal Code to allow food trucks, food carts, and mobile retail food establishments to operate at the Coal Creek Golf Course within a residential zone district. Second by Brauneis. Roll call vote.

Name	Vote
Chris Pritchard	Yes
Cary Tengler	Yes
Steve Brauneis	Yes
Jeff Moline	Yes
Ann O'Connell	Yes
Tom Rice	Yes
Scott Russell	Yes
Motion passed/failed:	Pass

Motion passes 7-0.

- **Small Area Plan – South Boulder Road:** Review and endorsement of SWOT analysis and measures of success.

*Conflict of Interest and Disclosure:*

None stated.

*Staff Report of Facts and Issues:*

Robinson presented from Power Point.

- At the December meeting, Staff brought the SWOT analysis and measures of success, and the PC requested some modifications be made. Staff is presenting the modifications for PC review.
- Brief update, if approved tonight, the Small Area Plan will go to City Council on January 20, 2015.
- On Wednesday, January 14, 2015 in King Soopers parking lot, there is an walking audit up and down the corridor to look at bike and pedestrian issues interacting with cars. On Thursday evening, January 15, 2015, in Council Chambers, there will be a placemaking workshop to come up with solutions to the issues identified.
- February 18, 6:30 pm in Council Chambers, to discuss land use and form issues and developing alternatives for the corridor.
- Next Public meeting scheduled for April with planned adoption in May or June.
- Staff will get results back in February from survey currently sent out. The Wayfinding project that goes along with this should kick off in February as well.

- The public kick off meeting for McCaslin Blvd Small Area Plan on February 19, 2015 at 6:30 pm in Council Chambers.
- New questions on the website are up on the City website.

*Additional outside communication:*

Email to Planning Department from Alexandra Bradley received on Wednesday, January 7, 2015 regarding Small Area Plan and email from Sid Vinall on Tuesday, January 6, 2015 regarding Small Area Plan. Motion made by Moline to enter emails into the record, seconded by Brauneis. Passed by voice vote.

Recess taken at 8:23 pm, resumed at 8:26 pm.

*Staff Report of Facts and Issues:*

Robinson discusses the changes made to SWOT Table and Principles.

- SWOT Table Interpretation

	Positive	Negative
<b>Internal</b>	<u><b>Strengths</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parks and open space near corridor</li> <li>• Physical form of the corridor (parcel sizes and rights-of-way)</li> <li>• Proximity to existing neighborhoods</li> </ul>	<u><b>Weaknesses</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian and bike connections are lacking, <b>uninviting, and perceived as unsafe</b></li> <li>• Conformity to community values</li> <li>• <b>Aesthetic Appearance</b> of corridor</li> <li>• <b>Connections to adjacent neighborhoods</b></li> </ul>
<b>External</b>	<u><b>Opportunities</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corridor as transportation link</li> <li>• Shops, businesses, and services on corridor</li> <li>• Valuable mix of uses on corridor</li> </ul>	<u><b>Threats</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Provide additional uses</del> <b>Impact of the market and regional competition on existing and desired land uses</b></li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Train noise and impacts</li> <li>• <b>Lack of community consensus on desires</b></li> <li>• <b>Upkeep of existing buildings</b></li> </ul>

**Principle 1** - Provide for safer and more convenient connections across South Boulder Road and Highway 42 for bikes and pedestrians.

a) Provide safe and convenient facilities that serve a broad range of users with multiple modes of travel

- Are all modes of travel accommodated?
- Are users of all ages and ability levels accommodated?

iii) Do the improvements proposed provide safer conditions for all users and ability levels?

- Are existing deficiencies addressed?

- b) Design solutions that the City can realistically maintain over time
- c) Promote regional trail connectivity within the study area

**Principle 2** - Utilize policy and design to encourage desired uses to locate in the corridor.

- a) Do allowed uses serve community needs as defined in survey and elsewhere?
- b) Are allowed uses supported by the market?
  - i) To what extent are incentives needed to induce identified uses to locate in the study area?
- c) Does the land use mix demonstrate positive fiscal benefits?
- c)d) **Is the process for approving desired uses and desired character simpler and more predictable?**

**Principle 3** - Establish design regulations to ensure development ~~conforms to~~ reflects the community's vision for the corridor **while accommodating creativity in design.**

- a) ~~Match~~ **Physical form to** ~~should incorporate~~ desires expressed in community survey and elsewhere
- a)b) **Allow flexibility for changes in market requirements, design trends, and creativity in design.**

**Principle 4** - Mitigate impacts of trains and improve safety of railroad crossings

- a) Address train noise
- b) Address traffic impacts from train

**Principle 5** - Balance the regional traffic needs of South Boulder Road and Highway 42 with the community's desire for safety and accessibility.

- a) Make sure traffic passing through the corridor does not make it an undesirable place to live, work, play, and travel
  - i) Does traffic noise decrease?
  - ii) Do pedestrians and bicyclists feel safe?
  - iii) How long will a trip take on the corridor?
- b) Accommodate future regional transportation plans **and maintain the area as a regional corridor**
  - i) How does the corridor alternative adequately address future transportation needs?
  - ii) How does the corridor alternative accommodate adopted regional transit plans?
- c) Provide safe and efficient access **and visibility** in strategic locations for proposed land uses

**Principle 6** - Provide for community gathering spaces and public infrastructure to encourage visitors to spend time in the corridor.

- a) Provide for community amenities identified in survey and elsewhere
- a)b) **Provide programming to activate public spaces**

*Commission Questions of Staff:*

Russell says he does not recall the discussion on upkeep of existing buildings.

Robinson says it was discussed.

Pritchard says that it may have been in reference to multiple owner businesses.

Pritchard asks if council is okay with changes to the SWOT table.

Tengler answers yes.

Principle 1 had no changes.

Principle 2 with additions. No comments or corrections.

Principle 3 with additions.

Tengler says that his concern of little too specific in conforming in matching. This better reflects his view. In the email from Mr. Vinall, he suggested that “conforms” is a better choice of words. Russell says that “reflects” is a good term because it acknowledges the fact that we cannot control everything and we cannot commit to everything that we are asked to do.

Pritchard states he likes the word “reflects” as well. Staff has found an appropriate word.

Russell discusses a)b) **Allow flexibility for changes in market requirements, design trends, and creativity in design.** He states that “allows flexibility to respond to changes in market requirements”.

Tengler and Pritchard agree with the changes Russell.

Robinson says he will change the wording to “allows flexibility to respond to changes.”

Principle 4 had no changes.

Principle 5 with additions. No comments.

Principle 6 with additions.

*Public Comment:*

Jean Morgan, 1131 Spruce Street, Louisville, CO 80027.

She discusses the incorporation of the public input as it pertains to the Small Area Plan and the SWOT report. She attended the public hearing for SOBORO on October 8, 2014.

- Question #1 - How do you use South Boulder Road corridor and its surrounding properties and amenities. How would you like to use it in the future? Q
- Question #2 – What do you think the core community values identified in the Comp Plan along the corridor and as the corridor evolves, how do you think the core community values should be incorporated into it?

She has papers of handwritten responses which she typed up so they are more readable for the public and Boards and different departments of Louisville. There were 178 responses to question #1 and 99 to question #2. She has reviewed the comments concerning the appearance of the corridor as being a negative or a weakness as reported in the SWOT. From the 277 responses, she found only 6 comments pertaining to appearance and they listed more or better landscaping, gardens, preservation of trees in open space. 2 of the 6 said “not the most attractive” and “want it to be a more beautiful part of the neighborhood.” She fails to see how these few comments on appearance were given so much weight in the SWOT.

She made a compilation of the five most mentioned comments by the public on these two questions. It was a total of 80 of the 277 responses which seemed to be in general agreement with the Planning Department’s conclusions about lack of bike and pedestrian friendliness, South Boulder Road as a north-south barrier that is difficult to traverse especially for students, creation of a small town feel on the road, and desire for fiscal responsibility and low density along the corridor.

She is confused about the lack of community consensus on desires. There is a lot of information and she would encourage the PC review of this document which is included at the end of the PC agenda for December 2014.

She gives her input on the changing of the word “conform to public opinion” as far as proposing changes along the corridor. She thinks “strongly reflects” or “consistent with” public opinion are good alternatives as we are a government of and by the people and citizen wishes for our community must be incorporated into City decisions.

At this public meeting in October, she heard Staff say that the font of the signage on the announcements which are now again on South Boulder Road is too small. People have

mentioned that as you drive by, they simply cannot read it. She hopes the problem can be corrected before the next Small Area Plan or the McCaslin Small Area Plan.

Tengler asks Morgan a question. Relative to aesthetics and bike planning, do you mean to imply there is more or less emphasis on either of them?

Morgan answers regarding appearance, she doesn't know why it is a negative as there were few negative comments about it.

Russell asks about definition of "small town character". What does that mean to her?

Morgan answers that in the responses, people said "small town character". It has not been fully identified and as a community, it should be explored and defined.

Moline asks if she thinks the current corridor has a small town character?

Morgan answers she thinks it could be improved upon, which includes parks and walkability, biking pathways, and strengths mentioned in the exercise. She thinks the exercise was a valuable tool and hopes it will be used on the McCaslin Small Area Plan.

Moline wants clarification from Russ regarding "corridor" and the definition of it. Moline's definition is it is not just the street, but the properties that front the street and extend back. Is this correct?

Russ answers yes.

Cindy Bedell, 662 West Willow Street, Louisville, CO

Resident in Louisville for 19 years. She thinks it is extremely important to listen to the constituents and not be carried away with planning. The residents should be considered and what the majority of them want. She is happy to see the outreach being conducted for communication and input. Her other impression is that the majority of the constituents do not favor turning the South Boulder Road corridor into a high density urban corridor. Regarding the small town character, her neighbors appear shocked at what is underway as far as possible plans for urbanization. Her opinion is that small town design standards and spacious setbacks are what make Louisville attractive. She thinks many other residents agree with her and would not be in support of design standards with zero or very short setbacks. Many residents also do not want a 3-story flat roof commercial roof such as what is being built on Canyon Street and Walnut Street in Boulder. She thinks the character of Boulder has been changed by these high density buildings. She does not think Louisville wants to go in that direction. She wonders who initiated this drive toward urbanization. Was it initiated by constituents or constituent feedback?

Paula Palmer, 1603 Cottonwood Drive, Louisville, CO

She is surprised to see the "lack of community consensus on desires" added to the study. She participated in the October public meeting and there was extraordinary consensus in the room. She thinks over 100 people were present. There was a well expressed consensus on the vision for South Boulder Road. She wants to know where the additional comments have come from and what the nature of those comments are.

Pritchard answers that in looking at the packet, while there were people participating in the open forums, the discussions with property owners were not necessarily in line with the community wants. There can be a "disconnect" with property owners who have vested rights in the community.

Palmer responds that citizens are also property owners. She wonders if these property owners were contacted separately and not a part of the October community event?

Pritchard answers that these property owners were present but did not feel they could give full disclosure. There is more information in the packet.

Palmer asks what the opportunities are for the different segments of the community to talk openly with each other.

Pritchard answers that the Planning Commission meeting is part of the process.

Russell states that the presence of the “bullet point” will have an incredible impact on the outcome of this plan and dialogue. Part of the discussion from the December 2014 PC meeting was the element of what is the predominant purpose of this corridor; is it a highly efficient transportation corridor or should it be considered differently in terms of community asset.

Michael Menaker, 1827 W Choke Cherry Drive, Louisville, CO

Menaker states he is a strong proponent of the apartments being built at North Main, the ones soon to be built behind Alfalfa's, and the proposed projects at Coal Creek Station. More importantly, those buildings are fully occupied. There are a lot of citizens living in the apartments who have voted not only with their present vote but with their dollars in support of some of the changes. The truth is that people always want progress but nobody wants change. There is no progress without change. In changing demographics and the need to provide and be inclusive for a new generation whose goals and values are different, then the bullet point is “right on the money”. He thinks it is a good thing. He argues that the diversity of opinion and mobile points of view make a better discussion.

Brauneis asks Russ about “who started this process” and about the phrase “high urban corridor”. Do you have comments to speak to how the process unfolded. There may be semantic issues about the use of the words; urban density may be different in your use of them than what people perceive them to be.

Russ states that there was conflict and difficulty in getting projects through the process. It was not good for the community or the landowner or the prospective investor in the City. Having a process where there is no consensus and 18 months of review is not good. If Louisville wants to see people invest in the City, the process needs to be cleaned up. Staff saw a conflict in policies. There were economic development goals coming from business retention and development committee. The LRC and City Council were seeing community preservation goals from the same entities. Zoning did not reflect those values. To address this, Staff is going through an update of the Comp Plan. The City of Louisville of today is not the City of Louisville of 1990's or 1980's. During that time, the city was in expansion mode with lots of land to annex, and policies were based on expansion. The City quickly ran out of expansive spaces. The annexation seen tonight is the last significant annexation the City will do. Our policies, however, assume we will be annexing green fields, and the policies did not align with our values. Staff hears about pedestrian challenges and traffic safety challenges, but they were not aligning with actual solutions. The Comp Plan tried to create a different language based on character. The Comp Plan is a vision document, not a zoning document. Staff used “centers, corridors, and neighborhoods” which are activities of the city and tried to define them into character. The characters in the Comp Plan language were “urban, suburban, and rural”. Rural is open space; suburban is Davidson Mesa, Via Appia, and McCaslin, and urban is downtown Louisville. The word “urban” is an emotional word but in its essence, it is people living in a town. Old Town Louisville is very “urban”; it is not dense but it is urban. It has alleys, buildings are close to the street, there are interconnected streets and the pedestrian sidewalks are all connected. The McCaslin corridor is designated “urban center” because it is an economic center. Development along Via Appia is different than development in Downtown Louisville but the zoning did not reflect it. Staff is identifying what the community wants the buildings to look and feel like on South Boulder Road, hence the community survey.

Sid Vinall, 544 Leader Circle, Louisville, CO

On the input from the large stakeholders on South Boulder Road, there were comments in the Small Area Plan that were on the website. He cannot find it.

Pritchard says it is on page 136 in the December 2014 minutes PC packet.

Vinall wonders if the comments were ever made at a public meeting?

Russ answers that on December 5, 2014, the Business Retention and Development Committee (BRAD) which is a subcommittee of City Council with three elected officials and is a posted City Council meeting, sponsored a developers forum. It was posted and put out. The question was asked from the business and commercial side to get their perspective.

Robinson says the notes in the packet were from stakeholder interviews held in December 2013. The notes from the December 2014 meeting were not posted in the packet. The minutes will be in the next BRAD packet.

Vinall asks how citizens can access these notes?

Robinson says the BRAD December 2014 minutes will be in the January 2015 BRAD packet.

Pritchard asks if they are on the website now?

Menaker says the summary from the recent BRAD meeting held Monday, January 5, 2015 includes the summary from December 2014. The summary is found on the City website. Menaker will show Vinall the link.

Vinall continues with his statement. A couple years ago, the PC was dealing with the plans for the redevelopment of the Safeway site. The developer wanted to build approximately 200 apartment units, filling up almost half of the site. It was by Special Review Use and had to be rezoned. At that time, a large number of residents turned out for both PC and City Council meetings to object to the plans. There were long and hard discussions. That project was turned down by City Council but later a new plan was proposed which included a grocery store and 8000 SF of commercial space and the apartment units were reduced from 200 down to 110. Currently, we see the Alfalfa's store and new commercial space with businesses in place. Tonight, the PC is looking at the Small Area Plan which to him is a large area plan. It extends from Via Appia to the Lafayette border. He does not know if the PC will see a large amount of residents turning out similar to several years ago, but he thinks the City is doing a better job of advertising this type of project. He sees more signs around town giving notice to the citizens about meetings. There are also emails coming from the Planning Department notifying people. It was encouraging to see a large number of citizens attend the kick-off meeting in October 2014 and at that time, there were a number of comments which we have heard in the summary by Jean Morgan. Hopefully, the City-wide survey for the South Boulder Road Small Area Plan which was sent out last month will provide more information and feedback for both the PC and City Council. In regard to the survey, he thinks it was very helpful and if the right questions are asked, as one who received and filled out the survey, he felt more accurate information could have been obtained with better worded and more direct questions. He was dismayed particularly with the picture section which already assumed that citizens had wanted to see high density development along the South Boulder corridor. All you had to do was to choose which form you wanted these developments; two or three stories or 5' back from South Boulder Road, 10' back, or 15' back, or a parking area. For him, it was like being asked to choose the least worst option. As of now on South Boulder Road, from Table Mesa to the Lafayette line, there is no stretch of road where there is any high density, two or three story developments 10' from the road. It is a beautiful tree-lined corridor and it is a pleasure to drive from Boulder and come into Louisville. He knows some members of the PC were at the kick-off meeting which he attends, and it appeared apparent to him that there did not seem to be much interest in having more high-density, in your face development along this corridor, particularly because of all the new development at Steel Ranch, North End, the 110 units next to Alfalfas, the DELO project, Highway 42 developments. What he thinks occurred at the kick-off was the input centered around making the corridor more bike and pedestrian friendly, safer crosswalks, and possibly an underpass near Main Street, upgrading and making more attractive the present shopping centers, improving the traffic flow and keeping the tree-lined corridor as is. The question then seems to be, how much development is too much, and what is the right development. We are not alone in this. Many residents in Boulder have been highly vocal about these issues and critical of how the planning process works. Even in the people in Superior and Erie are raising

their concerns. So the City seems to promote getting more citizen involvement which is helpful for both the City and the citizens, he hopes that the PC and the City Council will pay closer attention to what they are hearing from their Louisville neighbors. Most of us want to see healthy development and improvements in Louisville, but not at the expense of losing our small town character. We can have the conversation of what small town character is and it may be an abstract issue, if you see it, you'll know it. After you have had a chance to review all the information and citizen input regarding the redevelopment or development ideas for South Boulder Road, he hopes the PC will make the recommendations to City Council that are in the best interest of the City and its residents. He was looking at the community weekly in the Daily Camera a few weeks ago, and an advertisement caught his eye from a newer business, Elevations Credit Union, on McCaslin. The advertisement said "Here's to a return to what matters, to knowing your true social network is physically located in the community that you call home. Here's to Main Street, not Wall Street."

*Closed Public Hearing and discussion by Commission:*

Pritchard asks that based on the SWOT analysis, is PC comfortable with the changes red-lined in the document? Are we in support?

Russell asks if the purpose of SWOT analysis is to be a transcript or summary of the feedback you received at the kick-off meeting or is it a combination of kick-off and stakeholders.

Russ answers that this is more than the public meeting. We have EnvisionLouisville.com, we have numerous interactions with the community both in terms of stakeholders, BRAD committee, City Council doing proactive research, and Staff has a number of ways to get information to and from the public. This is trying to summarize it and give some guidance to the community as we get physical. The next stage is to take this and actually put strategies on the ground. From a SWOT perspective, it is intended to raise awareness to what we find as a community as challenging; the entire community, not a niche of the community. The Principles are meant to "this is what we hope to achieve". When we come up with alternatives, we want to measure them. Alternatives will be guided by the Principles; the SWOT is to simply raise awareness to the challenges and opportunities that are before us.

Russell says the answer is helpful. When he thinks about the aesthetic appearance of the corridor, he would be open to taking that out. He thinks about driving over the hill down South Boulder Road on a summer day, it is nice. When you get farther east, it gets sketchy, but is that the most important weakness to talk about. He is find keeping it in and fine taking it out. The lack of community consensus on desires says there is a lack of consensus on the primary purpose of the corridor. Maybe it less an issue of community consensus and more an issue of what is the purpose of the corridor. This is an issue that all communities are dealing with, what do you do with a big road like that? On Principle 3, we could say that established design regulations to insure development "closely reflects" because he doesn't think you can "strongly reflect" the community's vision.

Tengler says he is in favor of keeping the notion of the "appearance of the corridor" as we are talking about a relatively small segment from the other side of the ball fields to Via Appia, not considering the vista going down the hill on South Boulder Road. We are talking about a much smaller section and candidly, he thinks there are some areas within that stretch that could use some work from a visual standpoint. He is in favor of keeping "closely reflects". He is comfortable with the rest of the SWOT analysis and the rest of the Principles that Staff has modified from the last PC meeting.

Rice says that the Threats sections could perhaps be better stated as Challenges but then it would not be SWOT. From his perspective, not announcing that there is a lack of consensus ultimately but that this is a challenge we need to work through to see if we can drive consensus.

To the extent that consensus cannot be achieved, then that is a challenge. But if it can, then it does not become co. He is comfortable with the way it is in the SWOT and in Principle 3.

Brauneis says he is comfortable with “closely reflects” as well. He interprets the “lack of community consensus and desires” as Rice does and does not think cause of consensus to grow; he thinks it is simply acknowledging it as part of the dynamic of a process like this. When it comes to the appearance issue, he reads it to mean that we would be celebrating the more attractive portions of the road, and to try to transfer it to other areas. The trees in the middle are fantastic. The inclusion of the appearance of the corridor as a weakness will not cause us to chop down the trees; if anything, it will help us improve other areas within it.

Moline says he is comfortable with the explanations about the way we have it now. He is comfortable with the comments he has heard for modifications.

O’Connell says that on the aesthetic appearance, her feeling is to keep it in. It actually ties in with the weakness of the pedestrian and walkability because when driving through the corridor, it is beautiful with the trees. With the walkabout, you start noticing litter and things needing upkeep. If we can see these things as entwined and then it ties into the lack of consensus on the purpose, is this a drive-through or is this small town walkability. If the purpose is seen more to be more walkable area, then we need a lot of aesthetic improvement. Those remain big weaknesses to her. She is in favor of changing the wording to the lack of consensus on the purpose of the corridor than keeping it on community desires. She is fine with the changes redlined. She does not feel strongly changing it to “closely reflecting”; she thinks reflecting captures it.

O’Connell excuses herself at 9:28 pm due to illness.

Pritchard says he agrees with O’Connell. He likes the SWOT analysis and overall, it reaches the objectives. In terms of the red lines on the SWOT analysis, he is in favor with the slightly tweaking of the language in regard to the community consensus issue. In regard to the Principles, he is very comfortable with them. He is in support. He asks Robinson to take the PC suggestions regarding the SWOT Threat, community consensus.

**SWOT analysis** – PC gives affirmative voice consensus.

**Principles** - PC gives affirmative voice consensus.

#### Planning Commission Comments

Brauneis asks about utility activity along Centennial and behind some houses. Does Staff know what is happening there.

Bill Seaton, 2396 McKinley, Louisville, CO

Seaton states that the utility company is running power lines from the Open Space down the easement under the railroad tracks. Some of the equipment is still in the easements.

#### Staff Comments

Russ speaks about items needing annual confirmation.

- Open Government & Ethics Pamphlet – 2015 Edition
  - Ethics Training Tengler and Russell may need to take Ethics Training
- Public notice update
  - City Hall, 749 Main Street
  - Library, 951 Spruce Street
  - Recreation/Senior Center, 900 Via Appia (move in front of the desk)
  - Police Department/Municipal Court, 992 Via Appia

- o City Web Site: [www.LouisvilleCO.gov](http://www.LouisvilleCO.gov)
- 2015 Meeting dates
- Elect Chair and Vice Chair
  - o Tengler to continue as Vice Chairman
  - o O'Connell to continue as Secretary

Motion to elect current officers by Rice, seconded by Brauneis. Motion passed by voice vote.

Items Tentatively Scheduled for the regular meeting: February 12, 2015:

- **DELO Phase II:** A request for a final subdivision plat and a final planned unit development (PUD) to develop phase 2 of the 11.31 acres within the core project area of the HWY 42 framework plan. The project includes a diversity of housing products, civic spaces, urban plazas, streetscapes and commercial opportunities. Case #14-039-FS/FP/UR
  - Applicant, Owner and Representative: RMCS, LLC.
  - ☐ Case Manager: Sean McCartney, Principal Planner
- **DELO Plaza:** A request for a final plat and final planned unit development (PUD) for the redevelopment of a 3.9 acre property within the core project area. The redevelopment includes the addition of approximately 18,700-23,000 sq. ft. of commercial space. Case #14-035-FS/FP/ZN
  - Applicant and Representative: RMCS, LLC.
  - ☐ Owner: TEBO Properties
  - ☐ Case Manager: Sean McCartney, Principal Planner
- **Howard Berry Water Treatment Facility:** A request for a special review use (SRU) to permit the construction of a new at grade sand drying bed to handle the water treatment plant residuals. Case #14-050-UR
  - ☐ Applicant, and Representative: Hatch Mott MacDonald
  - ☐ Owner: City of Louisville
  - ☐ Case Manager: Sean McCartney, Principal Planner
- **Grain Elevator Final Plat and PUD:** A final plat, final planned unit development (PUD), and special review use (SRU) request to add 8,000 square feet to two existing commercial buildings and construct a new 15,000 square foot commercial building. Case #14-048-FS/FP/UR
  - Applicant and Representative: Louisville Mill Site LLC (Erik Hartronft)
  - Owners: City of Louisville and RCC LTD
  - Case Manager: Scott Robinson, Planner II

Adjourn

Tengler made motion to adjourn, seconded by Rice. Pritchard adjourned meeting at 9:40 pm.